R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 936 CG 001 150

STUDENT ACTIVITIES STAFF FUNCTIONS--SUM AND SUBSTANCE.

BY- MARINE, JAMES
AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSN.

PUB DATE APR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK, *COCURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, STUDENT COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP, RESEARCH, QUESTIONNAIRES, STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, *COUNSELOR FUNCTIONS, AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSN.

THIS STUDY WAS DESIGNED TO ASSESS (1) THE CURRENT STATUS OF STUDENT ACTIVITIES (S.A.) WORK, (2) THE PERSONS ASSUMING MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE S.A. FUNCTION AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS, BACKGROUND, AND GOALS, (3) THE FUNCTIONS OF PERSONS WHO TAKE LEADERSHIP FOR S.A. PROGRAMS, AND (4) THE TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN S.A. COPIES OF A FIVE-PAGE QUESTIONNAIRE WERE SENT TO THE FUNCTIONING DEAN OF STUDENTS IN EACH INSTITUTION INCLUDED IN THE POPULATION OF 1,000 FOUR-YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. THE DATA IS PRESENTED IN 11 TABLES. THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME BROAD CONCLUSIONS FORMULATED BY THE WRITER AS A RESULT OF DIGESTING THE FINDINGS. LEADERSHIP FOR THE S.A. FUNCTION IS GENERALLY PROVIDED BY PERSONS IN GENERALIST POSITIONS. THE DEVELOPMENT OF S.A. SPECIALISTS OCCURRED PRIMARILY IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES. S.A. STAFF HAVE VARIED FUNCTIONS AND ARE INFLUENTIAL IN THE CREATION OF CAMPUS CLIMATE. A MINORITY OF S.A. STAFF SEE RESEARCH AS A MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY. FURTHER UPGRADING OF THE PRIORITY GIVEN TO THE FUNCTION IS NEEDED. STUDENTS ARE ASSUMING MORE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR ACTIVITIES, CASTING THE STAFF MORE IN THE ROLE OF CONSULTANTS RATHER THAN SUPERVISORS. APPROACHES CITED BY STAFF MEMBERS TO KEEP ABREAST OF TRENDS ON THE CAMPUS ARE PRESENTED. (AUTHOR/IM)

ED017936

STUDENT ACTIVITIES STAFF FUNCTIONS: SUM AND SUBSTANCE

Report of American College Personnel Association,
Commission IV Study

By: James Marine

April, 1968

CG 001 150

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT ACTIVITIES STAFF FUNCTIONS: SUM AND SUBSTANCE
(A Summary Report of an ACPA Commission IV Study)

Leaders in the student personnel field have advocated the development of professionals or specialists in student activities work (Bloland, 1965) and specialized programs of undergraduate education for those planning to work in the area (Pruitt, 1966). The underlying assumption of these proposals was that a well prepared professional staff can make significant contributions to the education of students through extraclass activity programs. It was also suggested that, in the past, the priority in terms of status and remuneration given to the activity function has not been high enough.

Recently, there have been some indications that progress is being made toward higher priority for the activities function. With attainment of more status for student activities positions and the development of specialists it is felt that qualified persons who bring background, experience, and stability to this area of the student personnel field may be attracted.

Early in 1966, the idea of conducting a study of student activities staff functions in four-year institutions of higher education was discussed in meetings of ACPA Commission IV (The Students, Their Activities and Their Community). In August of that year, a sub-committee meeting was held to develop procedures for such a study. Though the study was temporarily postponed, a pilot study of student activities staff in 12 Midwest colleges and universities was conducted in 1966, and the results reported at the 1967 American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention. It was decided by Commission IV at the convention that the larger study would be carried out during the 1967-68 academic year, the primary responsibility for conducting the study being assumed by the writer, with some financial assistance from ACPA.

Objectives of the Study

The study was designed to assess the current status of student activities work; the persons assuming major responsibility for the student activities function and their characteristics, background, and goals; the functions of persons who take leadership for student activity programs; and the trends and developments in student activities. Who are the staff taking major responsibility for student activities in four-year colleges and universities? What is their educational background and experience? What are their professional goals? To whom do they report and how are they related to the academic areas? What are their functions and what is the nature of their contacts with students and faculty? What are the major current trends in student activities as viewed by the activities staff and what kinds of approaches are being used to keep abreast of trends? These are some of the questions to which, it was hoped, the study would provide some answers.

Procedures of the Study

In the study design, two copies of a five-page questionnaire were sent to the person functioning as dean of students in each institution included in the population of 1000 four-year American colleges and universities. In an accompanying letter on APGA letterhead stationery, the purposes of the study were explained and the deans were requested to have the person(s) assuming major responsibility for the coordination of student activities to complete the questionnaire.

The population of the study was the same as that used by Williamson and Cowan (1966) in their study of student freedom of expression. This population was selected primarily as a matter of convenience; John Cowan, as a member of Commission IV, helped design the study and offered to supply his list, a set of mailing labels, and his classification of institutions.

It should be noted that this population was composed of 1000 regionally - accredited, four-year, bacculaureate-degree-granting insitituions with enrollment of more than 100 students. The military academies, seminaries, art schools and proprietary colleges were excluded from the population. Included as separate institutions were independent campuses of large universities.

The first mailing of questionnaires was completed in October, 1967, and a follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents in December. Respondents were asked to return the questionnaire to the writer. Assurance was given that replies would be confidential and that no individual or institutional response would be identified in reports.

Responses to the Study

Usable questionnaires were received from 550 institutions (55% return) of higher education. As previously indicated, two questionnaires were sent to each dean of students, so there were two responses from 16 institutions; however, since they were not parallel positions for the most part, the response of the one person who had the major role in coordinating student activities was tabulated. Responses also were received from other institutions as follows: two responses from persons for whom their institution could not be identified; five who declined to participate; twelve who indicated the questionnaire was not applicable to their campus situation; ten indicating the questionnaire had either been misplaced or lost in the mail; one student government president; and one non-paid intern.

In order to determine if the sample was representative of the population, the chi-square "Goodness of Fit" test was used. Grouping the sample in the ten categories (developed by Williamson and Cowan) based on the variables of size, curricular emphasis, and type of control and comparing the sample with the distribution of the entire population in the same categories, the institutions were found to be representative (Table 1).

Table 1. Classification of Colleges and Universities by Type

Type of Institution	Number in Population	Number in Sample	Percentage of Population in Sample
Technical institutions	50	30	58.0
Large public universities	58	39	67.2
Small public universities	88	56	63.6
Teachers and/or state colleges	175	100	55.0
Private non-sectarian universities	64	34	53.1
Protestant universities	29	16	55.2
Catholic universities	34	17	50.0
Non-sectarian liberal arts colleges	130	61	46.9
Protestant liberal arts colleges	214	110	52.3
Catholic liberal arts colleges	158	87	55.1
TOTAL	1000	550	55.0

Table 2. Colleges and Universities in Geographical Accrediting Regions

Region	Number in Population	Number in Sample	Percentage of Population in sample
New England	87	47	54.0
Middle Atlantic	207	120	58.0
North Central	361	217	60.1
Northwestern (+ Alaska)	57	31	54.4
Southern	236	114	48.3
Western (+ Hawaii)	52	21	40.4
TOTAL	1000	550	55.0

Using the same procedure, it was found that the institutions were representative of the six geographical accrediting regions (Table 2).

Because 24 of the institutions originally classified as small public universities had grown to the extent that they surpassed the enrollment figure used to designate large public universities in the Williamson-Cowan research, they were re-classified as such in computing results for this study report. When the tabulated responses of staff from the 24 institutions were compared with those of the large public universities, it was found that they more closely resembled the latter, thus making the re-classification appear to be advisable. Therefore, in the report, results were reported from 63 institutions classified as large public universities and 32 classified as small public universities.

The Position and Background of Student Activities Staff

In reviewing the data showing frequency with which various titles were held by persons assuming major responsibility for the student activities function, several observations were made. First, persons with the title of director or coordinator of student activities or having this terminology included in their title represented approximately one-fourth of the respondents. These titles were most frequent, as was expected, in the public and non-sectarian universities and least frequent in the liberal arts colleges (Table 3). If one assumed, as an examination of responses seemed to support, that some of those respondents holding positions as associate or assistant deans of students and those classified as "other" had an essentially similar coordinating role, it was concluded that approximately one-third of the institutions had a centralized student activities position. In only slightly more than one out of twenty institutions was the union director the person who assumed major responsibility for coordination of student activities,

Table 3. Student Activities Position Characteristics by Type of Institution

Characteristic	Universities					Colleges					
	Large Public	Small Public	Private Non-Sectarian	Protestant	Catholic	Teachers and/or State	Non-Sectarian Liberal Arts	Protestant Liberal Arts	Catholic Liberal Arts	Technical	All Types
Title	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Dir. or Coord., Stud. Act.	38.1	37.5	35.3	18.8	23.5	23.0	16.4	16.4	12.6	23.3	22.5
Asst./Assoc. Dean Stu.	25.4	6.3	11.8	6.3	5.9	6.0	16.4	10.0	4.6	20.0	11.3
Dean, Men/Women	3.2	3.1	2.9	12.7	11.8	7.0	19.7	10.9	19.5	6.7	10.7
Dean of Students	7.9	18.8	23.5	31.3	29.4	31.0	27.9	52.7	55.2	40.0	35.5
Union Director	6.3	21.9	8.8	6.3	5.9	4.0	4.9	2.7?	-	3.3	5.1
Other	19.0	12.5	17.6	25.0	23.5	29.0[1]	14.8	7.3	8.0	6.7	14.9
% of Time in Stu. Act.											
75-100	66.6	56.3	52.9	50.0	76.5	54.0	47.5	55.5	44.8	56.7	54.4
50- 74	17.5	21.9	20.6	12.7	17.6	20.0	21.1	18.2	25.3	20.0	20.2
Less than 50	9.5	15.6	23.5	18.7	5.9	20.0	27.9	21.7	21.8	20.0	19.8
No Estimate	6.4	6.3	2.9	18.7	-	6.0	3.3	4.5	8.0	3.3	5.6
Academic Rank											
Yes	34.9	37.5	32.4	81.3	47.1	56.0	37.7	59.1	56.3	50.0	49.8
No	65.1	62.5	67.6	18.7	52.9	44.0	62.3	40.9	43.7	50.0	50.2
Salary (mean)	$ 12,949	$ 10,578	$ 12,161	$ 10,900	$ 9,945[2]	$ 11,661	$ 9,911	$ 9,880	$ 9,276[2]	$ 12,615	$ 10,947

[1] More than one-third of this group carried joint title of Director of Student Activities and Union Director.

[2] Approximately one-third of salaries in this category are donated, therefore not included in computation.

as indicated by the titles of respondents, that position being most important in this regard in small public universities. Thus, the dean of students, dean of men, dean of women and their assistants assumed the major student activities coordination role in more than half of the institutions. In examining the regional distribution of titles of respondents, the major variations were in the prevalence of the union director among respondents from the Northwest and the more frequent occurrence of deans of men and women among respondents from the North Central region (Table 4).

About half of the respondents reported to a person whose title was dean of students, vice president for student affairs, or some very similar title. A comparable proportion reported to the president of their institutions. The prevailing pattern was for the deans of students and some deans of men and women to report to the president, while most of the respondents with other titles reported to deans of students or vice presidents for student affairs. Less than five percent of the respondents reported to academic deans and vice presidents.

Tabulating the reported percentages of time spent by respondents in student activities work, it was found that 54 percent spent between 75 percent and 100 percent of their time in the area (Table 3). The staff from large public and Catholic universities reported spending the greatest proportion of their time performing student activities functions, and staff from Catholic liberal arts colleges (many of whom were deans of students) least. In examining the percentage of time spent in student activities by persons from geographic regions (Table 4), the major distinction was the lower percentage of staff from New England who reported spending at least three-fourths of their time in activities work.

Table 4 Student Activities Staff Characteristics by Region

Characteristic	Region						All Regions
	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	North Western	Southern	Western	
Title	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Dir. or Coord., Stu. Act.	25.5	28.3	23.5	12.9	17.6	14.3	22.5
Asst./Assoc. Dean Stu.	19.1	11.7	8.3	9.7	10.5	19.0	11.3
Dean, Men/Women	8.5	7.5	14.3	3.2	10.5	9.5	10.7
Dean of Students	31.9	33.3	35.9	25.8	39.5	42.9	35.5
Union Director	4.3	5.0	2.8	16.1	7.9	0	5.1
Other	10.6	14.2	15.2	32.2	14.0	14.3	14.9
% of Time in Stu. Act.							
75-100	42.6	58.3	49.8	58.1	61.4	57.1	54.4
50- 74	27.7	19.2	21.7	22.6	14.9	19.0	20.2
Less than 50	25.5	16.7	22.1	12.9	17.5	14.3	19.8
No Estimate	4.3	5.9	6.5	9.7	6.1	9.5	5.6
Have Academic Rank	42.6	45.8	49.8	54.8	57.0	42.9	49.8
Education							
Masters	89.4	84.2	83.4	80.6	84.2	71.4	82.3
Min. of year beyond M.A.*	8.5	14.2	9.2	16.1	9.6	9.5	10.7
Doctorate	23.4	18.3	19.4	25.8	25.4	42.9	22.4
Salary (mean)	$ 11,580	$ 11,117	$ 10,679	$ 10,748	$ 10,955	$ 12,337	$ 10,947
Age (mean years)	38.9	38.3	39.3	39.0	43.0	41.9	39.8
Professional Experience (mean years)	12.2	13.2	14.1	13.7	15.1	15.9	14.0

*Percentages in this category may be low due to respondents' only listing degrees.

Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding error.

It was found that almost half of the respondents held academic rank (Table 3). The percentage was very high in Protestant universities (81.3%) and lowest in private non-sectarian universities (32.4%) and large public universities (34.9%). Among the geographic regions (Table 4), the highest percentage of student activities staff holding academic rank was the Southern (57%) and the lowest was New England (42.6%).

Comparing staff by type of institution with regard to average annual salary (Table 3), it was found that salaries of respondents from large public universities was highest. Their average salary being almost $13,000. Lowest were the salaries of staff in Catholic liberal arts colleges, the average among those who received salaries in these institutions being $9,276. Comparing salary figures by geographic region (Table 4), staff from the Western region received the highest average annual salary ($12,337), with those from New England next highest ($11,580), those from the other regions being relatively near the average salary of all respondents ($10,947).

Reviewing the data on age of respondents, it was found that there existed a high degree of consistency among staff in the ten types of institutions (Table 5) and in the six geographic regions (Table 4). The age range in all categories except one was from the low twenties to the mid-sixties. The mean age of all respondents was 39.8, the mean age being highest among staff in Protestant universities (44.6) and the Southern region (43.0) and lowest in small public universities (36.9) and the Middle Atlantic region (38.3).

The mean number of years of work experience in education was 14, there being consistency among staff in different types of institutions (Table 5) and the geographic regions (Table 4). The highest mean number

Table 5.

Background of Student Activities Staff by Type of Institution

Characteristic	Universities					Colleges					
	Large Public	Small Public	Private Non-Sectarian	Protestant	Catholic	Teachers and/or State	Non-Sectarian Liberal Arts	Protestant Liberal Arts	Catholic Liberal Arts	Technical	All Types
Age (mean Years)	39.5	36.9	40.6	44.6	40.9	39.0	38.5	40.0	40.6	41.3	39.8
Professional Experience (mean years)	13.8	13.2	13.8	16.4	12.4	13.0	13.2	14.1	15.6	15.0	14.0
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Education											
Masters	90.5	62.5	76.5	81.2	58.8	80.0	85.2	89.1	82.9	83.3	82.3
Minimum of one year beyond M.A.*	7.9	3.3	11.8	6.3	5.9	13.0	4.9	14.5	13.8	10.0	10.7
Doctorate	36.5	6.7	26.5	43.8	5.9	30.0	19.7	20.9	11.5	20.0	22.4

*Percentages in this group may be low due to some respondents' only listing degrees earned.

of years of experience was found in Protestant universities (16.4) and the lowest was among the staff in the New England region (12.2).

More than four-fifths of the respondents were found to have at least the Masters Degree; more than one-fifth had earned doctorates (Tables 4, 5). In addition, 10 percent reported a minumum of one year of graduate work beyond the Masters Degree; this figure was likely less than was actually the case, since the form of the questionnaire may have caused respondents to list only degrees completed, rather than all graduate work. The highest percentage of staff having the Masters Degree was found in the large public universities (90.5%) and the highest percentage of staff with doctorates was found in the Protestant universities (43.8%). The percentage of those holding the Masters Degree and those having earned the doctorate were found to be lowest among the staff of Catholic universities. The geographic distribution of degrees held by staff was marked by consistency among the regions, with a somewhat higher percentage of staff in New England having the Masters Degree and almost double the average percentage holding doctorates found among staff of the West.

General Functions of Student Activities Staff

Information regarding the degree of responsibility for administrative, teaching, research, and orientation functions by respondents was obtained. Table 6 presents the percentage of respondents reporting major responsibility for, participation in, and no responsibility for: six selected types of administrative functions; class room teaching and supervising graduate students; institutional and student studies; and new student orientation.

Table 6. Percentage of Respondents Reporting Degrees of Responsibility for General Institutional Functions

Function	Degree of Responsibility: Major Responsibility	Participate	No Responsibility
Administrative			
Budget and report preparation	41.1	40.5	15.1
Correspondence (including memoranda)	61.6	32.9	3.1
Planning, furnishing, and supplying office(s) and/or other facilities	28.7	45.0	23.4
Recruiting, selecting and training staff	41.1	41.5	15.1
Record keeping (including financial records)	34.0	47.0	16.4
Supervision of student organizations and activities	77.8	16.6	3.3
Teaching			
Scheduled credit classes and related activities	8.4	20.9	68.4
Supervising interns, practicum and/or field work students in conjunction with a graduate program	3.3	11.4	81.0
Research			
Institutional studies	3.6	38.4	54.2
Student activities research	14.0	55.4	28.7
New student orientation	54.0	39.6	6.0

Percentages do not total 100 due to non-responses for function.

A comparison of the degrees to which responsibility for the general administrative functions was assumed by staff in the ten types of institutions was made. It was found that budget and report preparation was perceived as a major responsibility most often by the staff of Catholic and private non-sectarian universities. Correspondence was considered generally a more major responsibility among the staff of the universities than among the colleges. Planning facilities and the recruitment, selection, and training of staff were viewed most often as major responsibilities among staff of the public universities. Staff in all types of institutions reported consistently heavy responsibility for supervision of student organizations and activities, this responsibility being rated slightly lower in the large public universities.

The responsibilities of student activities staff for classroom teaching and for the supervision of graduate students were light in all types of institutions. Staff in Catholic and Protestant liberal arts colleges reported assuming classroom teaching responsibilities to a greater degree than did those of other types of institutions. The supervision of graduate students was most prevalent among staff of the large public universities.

Responsibility assumed for both institutional and student activities studies was consistently moderate to light in all types of institutions. The responsibility for the research function was perceived as being especially minor in the universities and technical schools. Overall more than half of the respondents claimed no responsibility for institutional studies and more than one-fourth indicated they had no responsibility for student activities research.

Staff in all types of institutions reported generally major responsibility for new student orientation. The responsibility assumed for this function

was somewhat heavier in the colleges and somewhat more minor in the large public universities.

In order to obtain information regarding the institutional committee responsibilities, professional organization activities, and community associations of student activities staff, they were asked to give the number of groups to which they belonged. It was found that, on the average, the respondents were members of between two and three institutional committees not directly related to student activities, with those from the technical schools having most committee responsibility and those from Catholic universities having least. It was found that the respondents tended to belong to between two and three professional organizations, with staff from the teachers or state colleges and Protestant liberal arts colleges being most active and those from private non-sectarian universities least active in this regard. Also, it was learned that the respondents typically belonged to between one and two voluntary community associations, the staff from Catholic universities indicating the heaviest participation and those from Catholic liberal arts colleges reporting participation in the fewest number of community groups.

Student Activity - Centered Functions

In addition to the more general functions described, the survey was designed to identify some more specialized student activity-centered responsibilities of staff. One type of function for which almost all of the respondents claimed some responsibility, as was noted in the discussion of administrative responsibilities, was the supervision of student organizations and activities. In order to determine the extent and nature of student activities staff work with organizations, additional data were collected.

In Table 7, the number of student organizations on the campuses and the number of groups advised by respondents of the ten types of institutions are presented. A wide range in the number of recognized groups was found within the categories and great differences among the types of institutions. The number of recognized groups in universities ranged from 15 to 500; the range in the colleges was from 0 to 125; and, the number in technical schools ranged from 4 to 200. As the table shows, the public universities had higher average numbers of student organizations and the liberal arts colleges the lower averages.

Table 7. Number of Student Organizations and Major Committees on the Campuses and Groups Advised by Respondents, by Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Average Number of Campus Student Organizations	Average Number of Student Organizations Advised
Universities		
Large Public	195	5.6
Small Public	100	4.9
Private Non-Sectarian	87	4.7
Protestant	56	4.5
Catholic	77	3.0
Colleges		
Teachers and/or State	55	3.4
Non-Sect. Liberal Arts	39	3.7
Protestant Liberal Arts	37	3.6
Catholic Liberal Arts	25	2.8
Technical	67	2.5

With regard to the number of student organizations for which the respondents were official advisors there was a wide range within the different groupings of institutions. The number ranged from none to 21 in the universities and none to 20 in the colleges; the range in the technical institutions was zero to seven.

The highest average number of organizations advised by respondents was found among the staff of public universities and the lowest (less than half as many on the average) was found among staff of the technical schools (Table 7). It should be noted that the figures represented the number of organizations for which the respondents were the official advisors.

In addition to serving as official advisor for some groups, it was found that the respondents had other functions related to a wide variety of student organizations: activity scheduling and registration; program advisement; financial advisement; and, arrangement of space and facilities for the activities of organizations. The staff in the study tended to work more closely in the performance of these functions with student government, coordinating groups (such as interfraternity council) and union boards. They worked least with athletics and intramurals, cooperative housing and house plans, and student publications. Respondents indicated that, in terms of working with most kinds of student groups, they assumed more extensive responsibility for registration and scheduling of activities and for arrangement for facilities than they did for financial advisement and program advisement. Most of their efforts in student organization activity programming appeared to be directed toward relatively few groups on the campus.

Selected student activities functions were explored to determine the involvement by staff in the areas of student activities policy formulation, leadership education (formal programs), and the publication of student activities materials. Table 8 presents the information obtained regarding the participation of student activities staff, by type of institution, in these functions.

Table 8. Percentage of Respondents, by Type of Institution, Reporting Their Role(s) in Selected Student Activities Functions

Function	Universities					Colleges					
	Large Public	Small Public	Private Non-Sectarian	Protestant	Catholic	Teachers and/or State	Non-Sectarian Liberal Arts	Protestant Liberal Arts	Catholic Liberal Arts	Technical	All Types
Student activities policy formulation											
Advisor to student gov't.	77.7	87.5	67.5	87.5	70.5	61.0	72.0	70.9	75.9	76.6	72.4
Member/consultant, stu.-faculty com.	92.0	97.0	76.5	93.7	70.5	79.0	88.5	87.2	75.9	76.6	83.6
Membership in faculty senate	25.4	31.3	47.0	50.0	35.2	29.0	41.0	52.2	39.1	46.6	39.3
Personally establish policies	22.2	46.9	41.2	50.0	23.5	43.0	54.0	54.5	41.4	50.0	44.0
Member, admin. committee	71.5	65.6	73.6	93.7	70.5	72.0	75.4	85.4	79.4	66.6	76.2
Leadership programs (formal)											
Consultant to planning group	77.7	84.4	58.8	68.7	70.5	74.0	60.6	66.4	62.1	70.0	68.7
Coordinate/direct programs	61.8	62.5	50.0	50.0	35.2	51.0	42.6	56.4	50.6	60.0	52.8
Participate in programs	68.2	62.5	58.8	56.6	58.9	61.0	44.2	56.4	43.7	63.3	56.1
Teach credit courses	9.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	3.0	1.6	1.8	0.0	6.7	3.3
Preparation/publication student activities materials											
Primary responsibility	57.1	46.9	50.0	56.6	52.9	55.0	54.0	47.3	40.2	63.3	50.9
Provide information for	65.0	71.9	44.1	43.7	52.9	60.0	50.7	54.5	47.1	56.6	55.3
Consultant to student groups	66.7	68.7	61.8	62.5	58.9	56.0	59.0	51.8	73.5	53.3	60.7
None	0.0	3.1	0.0	6.2	0.0	4.0	1.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.6

Instructions were to check all which applied.

In the formulation of student activities policies, in all types of institutions, staff were heavily involved as a member or consultant to student-faculty committees, member of administrative committees, and advisor to student government. Only two out of five were involved as members of the faculty senate organization; only in the Protestant liberal arts colleges and universities, where the highest percentages holding academic rank (Table 3) were found, were as many as half of the staff members of the senate. In only the non-sectarian liberal arts colleges and the protestant liberal arts colleges did more than fifty percent of the staff report personally establishing student activities policies; and, only slightly more than one out of five staff members in the large public universities and the Catholic universities report their establishment of policies. It was clear that such policies were, for the most part, formulated by group action rather than by individual dictum.

In formal leadership education programming, more than two-thirds of the respondents reported serving as consultant to groups planning such programs. More than half reported coordinating or directing programs and participating in leadership training. These roles were reported most frequently by staff in the public universities and the technical schools. Only 3.3 percent of the respondents reported teaching credit courses in leadership, most of these being found in Protestant universities, large public universities and technical schools.

Asked about their role in the preparation and publication of student activities informational materials, half of the respondents reported having primary responsibility for this function. Also, 55 percent reported providing information to be included in such publications, and 60 percent reported consulting with student groups which prepare such materials. Less than 2 percent reported having no responsibility for this function.

Realizing that student personnel workers are called upon for many kinds of participation in campus community activities, the student activities staff were asked to indicate their view as to the relationship between two areas of campus activity and their educational responsibilities. Table 9 shows the views of respondents, indicating that most of them feel these activities are either important or to some degree related to their roles as educators.

Table 9. Relationship Between Participation in Campus Affairs and the Educational Role of Student Activities Staff (According to Respondents)

Type of Participation	% of Respondents Viewing Relationship		
	Important	Related	Irrelevant
Participation in campus or campus-related workshops, speeches, etc.	61.9%	33.8%	1.6%
Attendance at student activities and events	79.1%	17.1%	1.1%

Relationships With Students and Faculty

A significant dimension of the student personnel role has been considered to be extensive personal contact with other faculty and with students. Therefore, staff in the study were asked to indicate the nature and extent of their contacts with students and faculty, and the results are presented in Table 10.

The vast majority of respondents in all types of institutions reported frequent contacts with individual students, both official (96.6%) and informal (83.9%). Also, more than nine out of ten reported holding meetings, seminars, and conferences with small groups of students. Depending on the type of institution, from three-fifths to four-fifths of respondents reported

Table 10. Percentage of Respondents, by Type of Institution Reporting Kinds of Contact With Students and Faculty

Nature of Contact	Universities: Large Public	Universities: Small Public	Universities: Private Non-Sectarian	Universities: Protestant	Universities: Catholic	Colleges: Teachers and/or State	Colleges: Non-Sectarian Liberal Arts	Colleges: Protestant Liberal Arts	Colleges: Catholic Liberal Arts	Colleges: Technical	All Types
Student:											
Frequent contact with individuals	93.7	100	97.1	100	100	98.0	98.5	93.6	95.4	100	96.6
Meetings, seminars and conferences with small groups	90.4	100	94.0	93.7	94.2	92.0	93.5	91.0	88.6	90.0	91.9
Meetings with large groups	77.7	78.2	67.5	81.2	64.7	75.0	75.4	61.8	72.4	73.3	71.8
Entertaining and meetings in home	46.0	37.5	64.6	62.5	17.6	35.0	68.8	62.7	16.1	40.0	45.1
Frequent informal contacts	79.4	84.4	76.5	87.5	89.2	84.0	88.5	82.6	83.9	93.3	83.9
Relatively little direct contact with individuals	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Relatively little contact with groups	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.7	1.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.3	0.9
Faculty:											
Frequent contact with individuals	81.0	90.6	73.5	93.7	64.7	90.0	83.6	87.2	79.4	86.6	84.0
Meetings, seminars, and conferences with small groups	55.5	65.6	73.5	75.0	52.9	70.0	75.4	71.8	74.4	53.3	67.3
Meetings with large groups	25.4	31.3	38.2	81.2	23.5	50.0	52.4	62.8	59.7	46.6	49.9
Entertaining and/or meetings in home	23.8	28.2	11.8	43.7	5.9	34.0	44.2	36.4	11.5	30.0	28.2
Frequent informal contacts	66.2	81.2	79.4	81.2	70.5	87.0	86.8	59.0	96.2	90.0	77.6
Relatively little direct contact with individuals	7.9	12.5	8.8	0.0	17.6	3.0	3.2	6.4	6.9	0.0	6.0
Relatively little contact with groups	17.5	21.8	17.6	0.0	29.4	9.0	8.2	7.2	11.5	16.6	12.0

having meetings with large groups of students. Entertaining students in their homes was most frequent among staff of non-sectarian liberal arts colleges (68.8%) and private non-sectarian universities (64.6%), and entertaining was least commonly reported by staff from Catholic liberal arts colleges (16.1%) and Catholic universities (17.6%). None of the respondents reported relatively little direct contact with individual students, and less than one percent reported relatively little contact with groups.

With faculty, 84 percent of the respondents reported frequent official contacts, and 77 percent reported frequent informal contacts with individuals. More than two-thirds reported meetings, seminars, and conferences with small groups of faculty; almost one-half reported meetings with large groups. Entertaining other faculty in their homes was reported by 38 percent of the respondents, this practice being generally more common in the colleges than in the universities. Only 6 percent of the respondents reported relatively little direct contact with individual faculty members and 12 percent reported relatively little contact with groups of faculty.

Reported Trends in Student Activities

The role of the student activities staff member is significantly affected by trends in activities.

To identify current trends, the questionnaire contained the open-end question, "What do you feel are the major current trends in student activities on your campus?" An analysis of the content of responses revealed the trends in Table 11, ranked in order of the frequency with which they were reported.

Table 11. Most Frequently Reported Trends in Student Activities

Trend	% of Respondents Reporting
1. Increased student involvement in institutional decision-making	38.7
2. Discussion and advocacy of national and international social-political issues	30.5
3. Less administrative supervision and control of individuals and groups	25.6
4. Involvement of students in community programs, especially social service	16.2
5. Shift away from traditional "collegiate" activities	15.0
6. Increased emphasis on cultural and subject-related activities	12.5
7. Small interest group, departmental, and residential programming	10.5
8. "Student power" and the strengthening of student government	10.2
9. More elaborate and varied student activity programs and facilities	9.8
10. Preference on the part of students for spontaneous, unstructured activities	6.9
11. Students are seeking more "relevancy" in their activities	6.2
12. Intensified interest, on the part of students for faculty to be more closely associated with them in activities	6.2

It should be emphasized that, by design, no structure was provided for the responses to the question; this procedure, it is felt, accounts for the relatively low percentage of respondents reporting the various trends. Furthermore, it is clear that the trends may be grouped to form more general trends: numbers 1, 3, and 8 are related, all of them having to do with students' assuming more responsibility and influence on the campus; numbers 2, 4, and 11 are related, in that each of them relates to concerns beyond the campus and the four-year span of the college experience; and numbers 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 indicate a general trend away from the large, organized, "things-to-do" type of social activity toward more informal groupings for activities

centered around interests of participants. It is apparent that larger proportions of the sample would have been shown to have reported these more general trends, had less specificity been employed in the content analysis.

In comparing the responses of persons representing the six geographical accrediting regions, it was found that there was a high degree of agreement in the frequency with which trends were reported from the various regions. When the trends were ranked, according to the frequency with which they were reported, the top two of each region were the same as those reported most frequently nationally; and the top five reported by each of the six regions were all among the top ten reported nationally, most of them in the top five national trends.

A very similar result was obtained when comparing responses from institutions classified in the following six categories: technical institutions; Catholic; teachers colleges and/or state colleges; public universities; protestant institutions; and other private non-sectarian institutions. Ranking the trends on the basis of the frequency with which they were reported, it was found that there is very close agreement among the institutions in the campus student activity trends listed by respondents. The five most frequently reported trends from the six categories of institutions were all included in the top ten reported nationally, most again in the top five.

Other trends in student activities on the campuses which were reported by more than a score of respondents included: a change in the role of student activities staff from a supervisory one to that of advisor or consultant; systematic student evaluation of their own organizations and activities; strong influence by off-campus persons, especially controversial speakers, in student activity programs; markedly greater participation in campus activities; growing demand for "big name" entertainment; and centralization in the organization of student activities. It was interesting to note that only two persons reported a trend toward disorders in activities on the campus and only one person reported a trend toward more minority group problems. It was also noted that only 14 persons reported more apathy in student activities.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore, in a general way, the student activities function - the personnel taking primary responsibility in this area, the nature of activities staff roles, and some of the trends affecting the development of student activities. The following are some broad conclusions formulated by the writer as a result of digesting the findings in this study.

1. Leadership for the activities function is provided by persons occupying generalist positions (as indicated by title and time devoted to student activities) in about two-thirds of the four-year institutions of higher education.
2. The development of student activities specialists has occurred primarily in the public universities, especially the larger ones, but it is a trend which seems to be growing in other types of institutions as well.
3. The functions of student activities staff are varied, with current emphasis on supervision of student organizations, participation in committee work and extraclass campus programs, and close association with student governing bodies within the institution.
4. Student activities staff have extensive official and informal contacts with both students and faculty as individuals and in small groups.
5. Although about half of the staff holding student activities coordinating positions have academic rank, only about one-fourth of them are directly involved in the academic program.

6. Through their involvement with new student orientation, student life policy formulation, and leadership education programs, student activities staff are influential in the creation of campus climate.
7. Research is perceived by a minority of student activities staff as a major responsibility for them.
8. Although comparatively recent extensive attention focused on the college student sub-culture may have led to a moderate raise in status and remuneration of student activities staff, further upgrading of the priority given to the function is needed.
9. Reported trends in student activities reflect changes in the structure and content of campus life, with students assuming more responsibility for themselves and their activities, casting staff more in the role of consultant than that of supervisor.
10. The activities of students are increasingly issue-oriented and inextricably related to the larger community.

Staff in the survey were asked what programs they were planning to keep abreast of trends on the campus. Among approaches cited were the following: evaluation and revision of campus governance structure to afford students more meaningful roles in shaping institutional programs; increased emphasis on the preparation of students to assume responsibilities on the campus and to obtain maximum learning from their experiences; efforts to facilitate consideration of social-political issues with regard to their relevance for

students; stimulation of student involvement in programs of the community beyond the campus; and, encouragement of discourse among various elements of the campus as a means for building interrelationships within the total educational milieu. These represent advances toward the development of more viable student activity programs.

The educative dimensions of the student activities function, including appropriate application of theory and research findings in extraclass programs, should have more adequate expression in higher education. A staff member who has the specialized preparation and skills to be an educator, in the fullest sense of the term, can contribute to the realization of the significant educational potential in student activities.

James Marine
Vice-Chairman, Commission IV

REFERENCES

Bloland, Paul A. "Emerging Patterns in the Staffing of Student Activity Programs." Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, 1965.

Pruitt, Wilton. "College Students, Their Community and Their Activities." In G. J. Klopf (ed.), College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1966, pp. 10-21.

Williamson, E. G. and Cowan, John L. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.